

REMARKS

Claims 2-15 and 17-29 are pending in the present application. By the above amendments, Claims 2-3, 8, 19 and 23-25 have been canceled without prejudice, and Claims 4-5, 9-10, 14-15, 17-18, 20-22 and 26 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. More particularly, independent Claim 10 has been amended to incorporate the limitations previously found in Claims 2 and 8, and the remaining claims amended to change dependencies. In addition, new Claim 30 has been added. Support for new claim 30 is found on page 10, lines 13-14 of the specification as filed. Applicants submit that the amendments are fully supported by the specification as filed and no new matter is being added. After entry of the amendments, Claims 4-7, 9-15, 17-18, 20-22 and 26-29 will remain pending and under consideration.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Although Applicants disagree with this grounds for rejection, Claims 23-25 have been canceled without prejudice in order to advance prosecution of the instant application.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 5-7, 14, 15, and 17-22 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the rejection. Specifically, the Examiner objects to the term "comprising" in Claim 5 as being an improper Markush format. Applicants have amended Claim 5 as suggested by the Examiner to replace "comprising" with "consisting of" thereby obviating this ground for rejection.

Claims 19 and 22 have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form. Applicants submit that the objections to Claims 19 and 22 have been rendered moot by the canceling of Claim 19 and amendment to Claim 22 to refer to the other claims in the alternative.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 2-6, 10-11, 17, 22-23 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Davis et al. (CA 1326632), and has rejected Claims 7, 12, 14-15, 18-21, 24 and 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al. (US 4,663,318), but has indicated that Claims 8, 9 and 13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By the above amendments, independent Claim 10 has been amended to incorporate the limitation of Claim 8 and any intervening claims (claim 2). As such, Applicants submit that amended Claim 10 is not anticipated by Davis et al. (CA 1326632) or rendered obvious by Davis et al. (US 4,663,318). Since all of the remaining claims pending in the instant application (Claims 4-7, 9, 11-15, 17-18, 20-22 and 26-29) depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 10, Applicants maintain that they are also in condition for allowance.

Serial No. 09/868,991

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant maintains that the application is in condition for allowance and passage to issue is earnestly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Mary A. Appollina/
Mary A. Appollina
Reg. No. 34,087

Johnson & Johnson
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003
(732) 524-3742
Dated: February 28, 2005